



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

REVIEW  
OF  
PROPHETIC SIGNIFICANCE  
OF  
EASTERN AND EUROPEAN MOVEMENTS;  
BEING A  
PLAIN, LITERAL, AND GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE  
LAST FIVE CHAPTERS OF DANIEL, APPLIED TO PASS-  
ING EVENTS; SHOWING CONCLUSIVELY THAT  
A SYRIAN PRINCE,  
NOT NAPOLEON III.,  
IS THE ANTICHRIST OF THE LAST DAYS.  
BY REV. J. LITCH.

BY THOS. WARDLE, M. D.



PHILADELPHIA:  
MERRIHEW & SON, PRINTERS,  
No. 243 Arch Street.  
1867.

## EZEKIEL.

### CHAP. XIV.

THEN came certain of the elders of Israel unto me, and sat before me.

2. And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying,

3. Son of man, these men have set up their idols in their heart, and put the stumbling-block of their iniquity before their face : should I be inquired of at all by them ?

4. Therefore speak unto them, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Every man of the house of Israel that setteth up his idols in his heart, and putteth the stumbling-block of his iniquity before his face, and cometh to the prophet, I the Lord will answer him that cometh according to the multitude of his idols ;

5. That I may take the house of Israel in their own heart, because they are all estranged from me through their idols.

6. Therefore say unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God, Repent, and turn *yourselves* from your idols ; and turn away your faces from all your abominations.

7. For every one of the house of Israel, or of the stranger that sojourneth in Israel, which separateth himself from me, and setteth up his idols in his heart, and putteth the stumbling-block of his iniquity before his face, and cometh to a prophet to inquire of him concerning me ; I the Lord will answer him by myself,

8. And I will set my face against that man, and will make him a sign and a proverb, and I will cut him off from the midst of my people ; and ye shall know that I *am* the Lord.

9. And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet ; and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel

10. And they shall bear the punishment of their iniquity : the punishment of the prophet shall be even as the punishment of him that seeketh *unto him* ;

11. That the house of Israel may go no more astray from me, neither be polluted any more with all their transgressions ; but that they may be my people, and I may be their God, saith the Lord God.

### “THE GREAT IMAGE.”

Under this heading, in a pamphlet of thirty-six pages, by Rev. J. LITCH, claiming to be “A Plain, Literal, and Grammatical Construction of the last five chapters of Daniel,” etc., the writer says: “The prophet declared that the dream was from God,—and informed the king ‘What shall come to pass in the last days.’” These words, which the author has italicised, would have no injurious tendency, if it were not for the evident use he intends making of them. As they stand, they are to be used as entering wedges, to split and divide the Scriptures of truth, and thereby make them subservient to his present system of futurism; and in this light they are a part of the sugar-coating, intended to make the nauseating dose go down without a knowledge of its bitterness.

I would ask, has there been no “hereafter” since the king saw the great image? Why attempt to prepossess the reader’s mind, by italicising a sentence and placing it in quotation marks, as if taken from Daniel’s second chapter,—putting words in the prophet’s mouth which are not his, and furthermore are not found in the book of Daniel? Where did Daniel “inform the king ‘what shall come to pass in the last days’”?

Admitting, for argument's sake, that the words were Daniel's, and used as the author says, would they not have their fulfilment in the declaration to the king, "In the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed"? Most certainly they would. No such use can be made of the words "last days," and apply them, exclusively, to a period yet future: that is, if the inspired apostle knew what he meant when he wrote, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these *last days* spoken unto us by his son." Heb. i. 1, 2. The last days therefore have reached already from Paul's day to ours.

#### THE TOES OF THE IMAGE.

"The ten toes of this image seem now coming up in Europe." p. 5.

"'It shall be partly strong and partly broken.' In fulfillment of this, the empire was broken into fragments, and has existed in the governments of Europe."—"The scattered and mingled condition of the Romans now exists." P. 4.

The last two quotations would be a sufficient answer to the former assertion, if it were not for the assumptions which follow the first.

"The ten toes of this image seem now coming up in Europe. On the western foot, England, France, Spain (with Portugal united), Italy (with Rome united) and Austria. While on the other foot will

be Greece (consolidated), Egypt, Persia, Syria and Thracia. The four kingdoms of the old Grecian Empire, with Palestine where it used to be in former days as the seat of the little horn." P. 5.

There is just as much reason to look for ten kingdoms in the future, to be attached to the Media-Persian arms, as there is for the ten toes. Then why attempt, on such an assumption, to foist upon the believers in the speedy coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, the notion, that "the four kingdoms of the old Grecian Empire are coming up again," "with Palestine where it used to be in former days as the seat of the little horn"?

The little horn of Daniel, 8th chapter, "waxed exceeding great toward the south and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." Not a word is said about his seat being in Palestine. We have always thought that a power had its *seat where it started from* to make its conquests.

#### THE TIMES OF THE GRECIAN KINGDOMS.

On page 14, our author makes another wretched attempt to pervert the word of God. He says:

"Those four kingdoms, then, are to have two times,—a *former time*, and a *latter time*. Their *former time* was from the division of Alexander's empire until the four were conquered and absorbed by the Romans B. C. 30, when Egypt fell. Their *latter time* may be reckoned from the recovery of Greek independence in the present century."

Daniel viii. 23, says: "In the latter time of their

kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up." What could be more transparent than the attempt to pervert these words, "in the latter time"? The angel does not say *times*, in the plural, but *latter time*, in the singular number. Then it is only one time,—viz., from the beginning to the ending. Could the divided Greek Empire have a latter time without having a former time?

Again, did Alexander's four Generals divide his kingdom between themselves? If so, is it not "a plain, literal, and grammatical construction of the angel's language,—'Four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation,'—viz., Alexander's kingdom? And was not the 4th verse of the 11th chapter of Daniel fulfilled then?

"And when he" (Alexander) "shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven, and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled; for his kingdom shall be plucked up even for others beside those."

Now if all this was an accomplished historical fact thirty years before the birth of Christ, what right has our author to say that the four horns of the Grecian kingdom have yet to come up? and then out of one of them shall come forth a little horn. How preposterous a theory! Admitting, for argument sake, that there should arise four kingdoms on

the territory of the old Grecian kingdom, could it be said "For it" (Alexander's kingdom) "came up (these) four notable ones," when Alexander's kingdom has not existed for more than 2100 years? With such a claim set up, and said to be "a plain, literal, and grammatical construction of the book of Daniel," one would think the claimant had never been conversant with the book of Daniel, and had not read even the most elementary history of the world. His speculations on the decline of Turkey he has a right to indulge, but when he says, "Palestine will be free to reconstruct as (an) independent power," we protest in the words of the Coming One: "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Luke xxi. 24.

Jerusalem, the capitol of Palestine, trodden down of the Gentiles until the end of the dispensation, and yet, Palestine an independent power! and we are told, page 15, "*Then* we are to look for the little horn to come out of one of them, (Syria and Egypt,) and do his work." Come out of where he waxed exceeding great towards!

If we were led to form an opinion from this, "Plain, Literal and Grammatical Construction of the five last chapters of Daniel," we should conclude, that the time of the end is not yet. The book is sealed; knowledge has not increased in our day; but turning away from this peurile attempt to a better light, we can rejoice that we live, and have been liv-



ing in the period called "the time of the end," since A. D. 1793.

### THE LITTLE HORN.

Our author quotes from Dan. viii. 13, "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot," and says, "It was not the ram nor his two horns which took away the daily sacrifice and trod the sanctuary and host under foot; nor was it the rough goat, his great horn, nor yet either or all the four horns. But out of one of them, (the four horns) there came forth a little horn which waxed exceeding great. By him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. He cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground; and he practised and prospered. All embraced in the question is done by the little horn."

A wonderful conclusion, truly!

That saint did not ask any thing directly about the rough goat, nor his great horn, nor yet either or all of the four horns, nor what should come out of one of them, nor, if a horn, how large or great it should become, nor what it should do, nor whether it should take away the daily sacrifice at all or not—none of these things were asked. They were voluntarily communicated to the prophet in vision, and although he sought for the meaning when he had seen the vision, there is not one word of proof to show that he asked a single question about it. All, all was volunteered to him.

This then strips his "Plain, Literal, etc.," and

leaves us free to consider, if we desire, the two questions as propounded by the angel or saint, and not those fixed up by our author.

“In expounding this vision to Daniel, the first thing named was, ‘Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision.’”

This is another assumption without proof. Leave out the italicised words “shall be,” as they are of no authority whatever in the text, and it avails him naught in his present theory.

“In expounding this vision,” &c., Gabriel had not yet begun to “expound the vision;” he simply made a declaration of a certain fact, which our translators have beclouded by the insertion of the words taken advantage of by our author; he used to know better; does he not now? He used to explain it thus, “Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end the vision *shall be understood*.” Is not this latter the plain, literal and grammatical construction of the passage? What nonsense it makes of this scripture to say, “for at the time of the end shall be the vision.” When Gabriel was told to “*make this man understand the vision*,” v. 16, “And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end.” This is an assertion of a fact, and not an explanation of the vision, v. 19.—But in the 20th verse he commences to explain to him, Daniel, the vision. “The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media

and Persia." Is not this and all that follows down to the end of the 25th verse the explanation of the vision? How it violates the plain, literal and grammatical construction of this part of Daniel's prophecy, to say, as our author virtually does, that the vision is yet future.

Strip the passage of the gloss which the italicised words give it, and examine it by the light which other portions of Daniel's prophecy throw upon it, and it needs no twisting to futurism. "Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end the vision." Now, as we are told that some things in this wonderful book of Daniel "are closed up and sealed till the time of the end," and that "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased," it is a plain, literal and grammatical conclusion, that at the time of the end the vision shall be understood, and to this agree all the scriptures, and so agrees our author on page 13, and says, "This is a strong point in interpreting the prophecy." Yes, and he who disregards or violates the order of the divine arrangement of the time of the end, cannot correctly understand Daniel's prophecy.

"If at the time of the end, we can find the horns of the goat in existence, and a power which unmistakably comes out of one of them, and who takes away the daily sacrifice, and casts down and treads under foot the sanctuary and host, we shall unquestionably find in him the little horn." P. 13.

We grant this proposition: "*If* at the time of

the end," etc. But where do we find any thing in connection with the time of the end connecting the horns of the goat with this period?—where, in the book of Daniel, except by inference, and that a forced and perverted inference? And is that "a plain, literal and grammatical construction of Daniel's prophecy?"

"If," &c. That *if* is of the utmost importance; it is the post, set up, to which our author attaches his block and hoisting-tackle, to hoist all that follows into anything like a show of truth; and this is done by forcing and wresting the Scriptures from their plain and literal meaning.

Did Gabriel say to the prophet that when the goat with the notable horn met its fate, and the four horns came up in its stead, and they in turn passed away, this was to be repeated at the time of the end, and then out of one of them shall come forth a little horn, which shall wax exceeding great—greater than Media and Persia, Grecia or all the four divisions of Alexander's kingdom?

Our author admits in this wonderful pamphlet that Rome was the successor to all of Alexander's divided kingdom. Then Rome was undoubtedly the Power that waxed exceeding great in territory. "It waxed great, to the host of heaven, and cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. Yea, he magnified even to the Prince of the host, and by him the daily was taken away, and the place of his sanctu-

ary was cast down, and an host was given against the daily by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it practised and prospered." All this Rome did during the height of her career, as brought to view in the 8th chapter of Daniel; and, so far as this chapter is concerned, Rome has no successor.

Were it proper here, we could show a reason for this—why God brings to our notice only four great dominions that have ruled our earth. There was a purpose in this, as there was in the vision in the 2d chapter, of the great image. In it there is no successor to Rome, the iron kingdom; its weakened condition is shown; it has no successor but God's everlasting kingdom.

Our author next asserts—"We do find at least two of those horns—Syria and Egypt—the king of the north and the king of the south—in existence and power at the time of the end. Dan. xi. 40. At the time of the end, the king of the south shall push at him, and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind."

Now, we assert, in answer to this assumption, that there is not a particle of reference, in the 40th verse of the 11th of Daniel, to Syria and Egypt; and as regards the "vile person," named in the 21st verse, he has no connection whatever, certainly not within 1000 years of the time when the 40th verse was to be fulfilled. This we shall be able to prove, before we end this review, in showing who the vile person was.

## OUR AUTHOR'S RULES—APPLICATION.

Our author gives us three rules of interpretation, and, as the first and third are all we need for our present purpose, we will transcribe them in full:—

“Rule 1st. A symbol once divinely interpreted, that interpretation must never be departed from except by the same divine authority.”

“Rule 3d. Prophetic times are to be understood and interpreted by the same rule.”

“If, therefore, we have one clear case of the fulfilment of prophetic times, that constitutes the rule for the interpretation of all prophetic time, unless God shall please elsewhere to give a different direction.”

“The first prophetic period in the Book of Daniel is found in the 4th chapter. It was the *seven times*, during which Nebuchadnezzar was to be, and was, driven from among men. It being fulfilled in the lifetime of that king, it must have been fulfilled in seven literal years, not in 2520 years. *Literal time, then, is the established rule.*”

“This fulfilment constitutes a precedent for interpreting all prophetic periods, unless it can be shown that God has given another rule in some subsequent passage.” Page 15.

Here, then, our author presents what he seems to think is a stunning proof against the established rule of what is called the year-day theory.

Look at it; ponder it well; it is *the* proof that all the pious, laborious and most intelligent and godly believers of the past ages have all been in error on the times in Daniel, and that which they thought it

took thousands of years to accomplish, is found out to require only a little over six years! and that all proved by simply reading the seven times in the 4th of Daniel!! How wonderful!!!

"The first prophetic period in the Book of Daniel is found in the 4th chapter," &c. After reading such a citation, in which the writer thinks he has obtained a triumph; "Literal time, then, is the established rule, constituting the precedent for interpreting all prophetic periods;" we very properly turn to the word, and ask, is this 4th of Daniel a prophecy?

And, secondly, is the period seven times, named in it, a prophetic period? To both these questions we answer, No!

The 4th chapter of Daniel was issued by Nebuchadnezzar as a proclamation "to all the earth." Did the king announce his insanity *before it took place*? Would Daniel issue such a proclamation without the king's authority?

"Nebuchadnezzar, the king, unto all people, nations and languages, that dwell in all the earth: Peace be multiplied unto you. *I thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God hath wrought toward me.*"

Can anything be plainer than this language of the king, to prove that it was his proclamation, announcing the events through which he had passed? and how could he tell his subjects "of the wonders that the high God had wrought by him,"

unless he told them the whole story—the dream, and its effects upon him, in verse 5—the decree he made, and the inability of all the wise men to interpret it; verses 6, 7—his reasons for calling in Daniel—his relation of the dream, and confession of the inability of all the wise men of his kingdom to make known to him the interpretation, and his declaration, “But thou art able; for the spirit of the holy Gods is in thee.” Verses 8—18. From the 19th verse to the 27th is Daniel’s address, and the interpretation of the dream; and from the 28th to the 33d, the certainty with which it came to pass, and the circumstances under which it transpired. The 34th verse speaks of the end of the days of his calamity, and his returning reason and power; and the last verse of this wonderful chapter records the dealing of God toward the king, causing him to exclaim:—

“Now I Nebuchadnezzar praise and extol and honor the King of Heaven, all whose works are truth, and his ways judgment; and those that walk in pride he is able to abase.”

Now we contend that, in the analysis of the 4th of Daniel, there is an overwhelming amount of force, in proof that when it was published or made known to “all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth,” it was a veritable history, and therefore not a prophecy.

So Rollin, the historian, declares it to be, and asks, “Was it possible for Daniel to ascribe such a



*manifesto* or *proclamation* to Nebuchadnezzar, if it had not been genuine ; to *speak of it as a thing sent into all the provinces*, if nobody had seen it ; and in the midst of Babylon, that was full both of Jews and Gentiles, to *publish an attestation* of so *important a matter*, and so injurious to the king, and of which the falsehood must have been notorious to all the world ?”

If the literal time theory rests for its proof upon the 4th chapter of Daniel being a prophecy, the holders of it are welcome to all the support it gives them.

If, then, the dream and all that appertains to it is proved to be a history, published to the nations of the earth, what becomes of the claim set up for the “seven times,” as “a rule to interpret all the other periods in the book of Daniel ?” Need I say they are like many other proofs the author has given us ? Certainly none would be so unwise as to deny that the seven times here are literal time, but we very much doubt whether any proof can be produced that the seven times which passed over the king were *seven years* ; we have not yet seen the proof of it, so we neither deny nor affirm. What else could it be but “literal time,” seeing it was fulfilled in the history of a literal king ?

Passing this point, then, as we are agreed that these seven times are literal times, but deny that they are a rule for interpreting anything else in the Book of God ; and as we deny this being a rule, or

constituting a precedent for interpreting all prophetic periods, we shall undertake "to show that God has given another rule," in some other passage. Let it be borne in mind by the reader, that all the Jewish Rabbis in the ages past, with but one exception, understood and believed the periods in the book of Daniel to be prophetic periods,—viz., that the 2300, 1290, 1260, and the 1335, stand as days for years.

Whence came this unanimity on this point, which has existed for many hundred years? I answer, from the exegesis of the passages with which the prophetic periods stand identified. This fact alone would require more than a mere assertion to remove it, and make literal of that which is symbolic.

"The Jewish Rabbis declared the literal day theory of the periods in Daniel to be a fiction of the imagination of those who entertained it, and that it is not found in the book."

Our author, to evade the force of the seventy weeks of Daniel, 9th chapter,—which received their fulfilment on the year-day theory, viz.: 70 times 7 = 490 literal years,—says:

"The week of years was with the Jews as literal as the week of days;" and cites us to Lev. xxv. 8: "And thou shalt number seven Sabbaths of years, seven times seven years, forty-nine years."

This he has given to prove that "the week of years was with the Jews as literal as the week of days." That is just the point, and all we claim,

that they understood God's rule of interpretation; they understood the rule, but in the book of Daniel they knew not where to begin the periods, because they "were sealed till the time of the end."

Again: "When God brought Israel from Egypt, and they searched the land forty days, he appointed them forty years to wander in the wilderness,—a year for each day of search."

How does our author know that "they were not appointed for a rule in any other case whatever?" Hast thou been in the counsels of the Almighty? He said: "After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, *forty days*, each day for a year." Who will dare to say nay to this, the Lord's rule?

Another Scripture proof stands in his way, which he dismisses, as it were, with a dash of the pen,—not deigning to tell where it can be found, and we are supposed to take for granted that it is all right; but as we are not of that class, we venture to examine the Scriptures on the point. Ezekiel iv.: in this and part of the third chapter, the Lord is showing the prophet the rule of prophecy, and introduces the type of a siege of a city, even Jerusalem; and tells Ezekiel in the 3d verse, this that you do "shall be a sign to the house of Israel." "Lie thou also upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it; according to the number of the days that thou shalt lie upon it, thou shalt bear their iniquity. For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the

days, three hundred and ninety days : so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days : I have appointed thee each day for a year." Here then is another proof of the Lord's rule for interpreting prophecy ; *two* examples in this prediction, and the Hebrew, according to the marginal reading, makes this rule very emphatic,—“ A day for a year, a day for a year.”

This, then, is not to be put away with the toss of the head, or the wave of the hand ; it is the word of the Lord, and it must stand ; it is the Lord's way of expressing a longer period by the use of a shorter one. “ A day for a year, a day for a year.”

Thus we have, in as brief a manner as possible, reaffirmed old truths, “ maintaining the year-day theory ” against those who “ reject it,” and found it no great “ burden,” for there is much more proof than we have space to present, having simply dwelt upon the passages alluded to by the author.

I ask again, is it any wonder that the Jewish Rabbis in the past ages understood and maintained that Daniel's 2300, 1290, 1260 and 1335 days were prophetic periods, and could only be understood as days for years ? and unhesitatingly declared that the literal day theory on the periods in the book of Daniel is only “ a fiction of the imagination of those who entertained it, and that it is not found in the book.”

Having destroyed the use our author attempted to make of the 7 times in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, and proved that it was a proclamation of the king's giving the history of the event, and shown from four different portions of scripture, that God has given a rule, not "a general rule," but *a rule*, by which he designates the number of years in foretold events, by giving their number in days; we leave our author to his assumptions and assertions, which he calls "a plain, literal and grammatical construction of the last five chapters of Daniel."

#### ON THE DAILY SACRIFICE.

"How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot."

We might suppose, from the above quotation, and the use the author makes of the language throughout his pamphlet, that they are all words of inspiration; now, with all charity for one with whom we differ, the truth demands that this point should not be glossed over. Truth is above friendship, or life itself, knowing as we do the writer's teachings on this passage, and having his former work before us, we are bound in all honesty to ask, Did he not insert the italicised word to serve his present theory of exposition? Does he not know now as well as he did when he wrote as follows, "The daily *sacrifice* is the present reading of the English text? But *no such thing as sacrifice is found in the original*. This is ac-

known on all hands. It is a gloss or construction put on it by the translators. The true reading is, *the* "daily and transgression of desolation,"—daily and transgression being connected together by "and;" the daily desolation and the transgression of desolation \* \* \* They are Paganism and Popery." Prophetic Exposition, vol. 1, page 127. If the above was true in 1842, is it not true now? If our translators inserted the word sacrifice in this text, and every other text in Daniel of like connection, and has been acknowledged to be a gloss on all hands, how has the word "sacrifice" become canonical in the texts, in this year of grace, 1867?

The attempt to show, (on page 18,) from the Septuagint the use of the word sacrifice, to enable him to use the inserted word in the text, which he has positively declared is a gloss or interpolation by the translators, fails him; for it is well known that the Septuagint contains many corruptions in texts, and particularly in reference to the coming Messiah.

Now what we ask and demand of the author, is, to show that the word sacrifice belongs there by necessity to a correct translation and understanding of the passage. Let him show this, and then we shall think he has made a step forward, and not backward.

## THE KEY.

"Gabriel's Instructions in the ninth a key to the eighth chapter."

True to the letter. But as we read pp. 18—19, we are constrained to believe the writer has lost or thrown the key away.

The very first thing which Gabriel undertakes to unlock with the key is the 2300 days of the eighth chapter: "Therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision, *seventy weeks* are determined," etc. Dan. ix. 24. The first thing our author attempts to do with this scripture, after the key has passed from him, is to give a new rendering of the word "determined," viz., "fixed upon."

Our author knows that students of prophecy have successfully maintained that the word *determined* is, more literally, "cut off," and that it has been triumphantly sustained by the highest authorities, Hebraists and others. It has been demonstrated that the Hebrew word which our translators have rendered "determined," is not found in any other place in the entire Hebrew Testament; it is therefore of peculiar importance, having this single signification of "cutting, or cutting off."

With this demonstrated fact, we may be able to see in what sense the ninth chapter is the key to the eighth, and why our author tries to give another signification to the word "determined." He has determined that the 70 weeks of Daniel's ninth chap-

ter shall not be attached to the 2300 days found in the eighth, as that would be damaging to the use he makes of those days. The 70 weeks he admits "were weeks of years."

These 70 weeks of years were no more "fixed upon the Jews and Jerusalem," than they were upon a thousand other things which occurred during the 490 years which intervened between the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, and anointing the most holy, by the entering of Christ into heaven itself, by his own blood, there to appear in the presence of God for us. If the 70 weeks of years were cut off from the 2300 years, and the first fulfilled in 490 years, "a day for a year," where is the ground to rest the shadow of an argument for the fulfillment of the 2300 days, in literal days, notwithstanding "his established rule for the interpreting prophetic time," which we have shown to be *no rule*.

Gabriel, in giving Daniel skill and understanding, declared to him, verse 24, the length of the period was 70 weeks, and what should be done in them; and in verse 25, gives him instruction where to commence the measurement; then to help him and us to understand the time, he divided and subdivided the 70 weeks, viz: seven weeks and threescore and two weeks, and graciously tells us what shall be done during these subdivisions of time; but as this did not fill up the time, only 69 weeks reaching to Messiah the Prince, after which he shall be cut



off; but he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week. Here, then, we have the full 70 weeks; God never goes back on anything he has said. "70 weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city;" and just prior to the end of the 70th week, the Jews committed the last offence, by cutting off the Messiah, after the 69 weeks and before the end of the one week—the 70th.—How condescending is our God to take such pains to make the understanding of his word sure. And is not this the plain exegesis of this scripture?—When did he, Messiah, confirm the covenant with many for one week, if not from his baptism to his ascension? He gave his disciples the token or proof of the last item being fulfilled, the anointing of the Most Holy, when he sent the Holy Ghost; this was the promise of the Father; "and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." They had been with him up and down in Judea, seen his works, beheld him crucified, saw him after his resurrection, but yet they waited to be confirmed in their faith of the Messiah. "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." This alone gave them power, the descent of the Comforter; this completed the confirming of the covenant for one week, and was all the proof they had that the work of redemption was completed. Messiah had anointed the Most Holy.

Let the author apply the work of this last week of the 70 to something to be done by an "Anti-

christ," "a little horn," "a vile person," if it suits his theory, and say it is yet future, that does not make it so; and in the absence of any proof on such a theory, we believe in the true Christ and the work he performed, and therefore trouble not ourselves about "a future daily sacrifice," a future "abomination of desolation," nor "an abominable idol set up in the temple at Jerusalem, to be worshipped on pain of death." Page 19.

" 'Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days; for yet the vision is for many days.' The subject, then, relates to Daniel's people, the Jews, and in the latter days.'" Page 20.

Certainly an *à priori* conclusion of the author's as to the Jews, for he has failed to show where the "Jew" is named in connection with "the latter days." There must be some mistake here either on the part of the angel or the "author;" for we have carefully read the quotations cited in the pamphlet, and also the 11th chapter, and we don't find the Jew once named. 'Tis strange that so important a word should be left out—"the Jew"—when the angel came on purpose to tell "what should befall the Jews." He named Persia, Grecia, their kings and princes, and a great many other persons and powers, Egypt, Edom, Moab, and the children of Ammon, and even the Ethiopians and Libyans, but not once the Jew. Oh, yes; the words "thy people" are to be found in verse 14, in connection with the "rob-

bers." But the author tells us on page 23—4 that that belongs to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, about B. C., 168, so that will not answer to the author's "latter days;" so we turn, in our inquiry, to God's word, and read: "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of *thy people*; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book."

Daniel's people are Jews, proselytes and Christians. Are they not Daniel's people who will sing the new song—"Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation?"

If these are Daniel's people, for whom Messiah was cut off, then we know what was to befall *them* in the latter days: they are to stand in their lot at the end of the days by virtue of having "their names found written in the book."

And for this the prophet was interested when he heard one saint ask another saint "How long the vision, the daily and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" Dan. viii. 13. He heard when the sanctuary should be justified, for the angel said unto him, "Unto 2300 days, then, shall the sanctu-

ary be justified." Verse 14. But he said not a word when the host should be delivered, viz., not be trodden under foot. Hence, Daniel prayed and fasted until he found the answer to the second part of the question, How long shall the host be trodden under foot? They will be given into the hands of the little horn with eyes. He will make war upon them, and prevail against them for a long time. "But the judgment shall sit," and the time come when "the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." This was the event that was to befall Daniel's people, and he wanted to know when it would be. "The thing was true, but the time appointed long."

"He understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision."

When did he obtain this knowledge?

After the history of the world, in its leading points, had passed before the prophet, and brought to light the time of the resurrection; after the time, times and an half had passed in review before him, for he had heard of those times before when the saints were given into the hands of that persecuting power. Dan. vii. 25.

"Then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?" Dan. xii. 8.

"And he said, go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end." 9th verse.

"Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty (1335) days. But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." Verses 12, 13.

So Daniel records, 10th chap. 1 v., "he understood the thing." The thing is the resurrection of the prophet and his people, whose names shall be found written in the book. Causing to pass in review the time, times and an half, (1260 days), and adding another period, (1290 days), which would confirm that period of the saints' tribulation, and assuring Daniel of the blessing which should come to them that wait, and come to the 1335 days.

#### THE TIME OF THE RESURRECTION.

It was not needful for the angel to cover "the entire series of events from the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia;" as these wonders had nothing to do with the date of the 2300 days, neither with their beginning or ending, being entirely disconnected from them; so we do not need "to start there," as the author supposes. (P. 34.) But starting at the period given by the man clothed in linen, who "swore by him that liveth forever, that it shall be for a time, times and an half," beginning A. D. 533, that most important period; for the 1290 was introduced, as a mark only, to confirm the other, and began A. D. 503; so that we are compelled to date from A. D. 533, as the commencement of that oft

repeated period. If we date the 1335 from A. D. 503, the end should have been in 1838; but God in His providence has brought us past that point, and shut us up to the necessity of resting upon the commencement of the 1260 days, viz., A. D. 533+1335=1868. Having examined these things for the ground of our hope, and finding no fault in them, we believe and teach them.

If these points can be defended successfully, we need no such speculation, as on page 34, about "the league and the covenant," "the sacrifice," and "the abomination," with the reduction of weeks to days, and multiplying by 7 to give 2555 days.

"From the time the league is made, till the sacrifice is taken away, and 1290 completes the week, to this is to be added 1335 days to the resurrection;" and this is called a "plain, literal, and grammatical construction of the last five chapters of Daniel," &c. This wonderful paragraph of figures and fancies, without one reliable fact to sustain them, is completed by giving us the astounding information, that it makes in all between ten and eleven years from the league to the resurrection, which league the author knows nothing about, as it is to him confessedly in the unknown future.

## THE ROMANS.

“All the divisions of Alexander’s empire were conquered and absorbed by the Romans, B. C. 30, when Egypt fell.” Page 14.

“From that point the Roman government has been the ruling power till now, over 2000 years.” Page 25.

“But the entire of Roman history, so far as this line of prophecy is concerned, is filled up in these few words: ‘Also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall.’ No more is said of them in the chapter, (Dan. xi. 14.)”

Can you, my advent brethren, believe it? Over 2000 years the ruling power on the earth, even until now, and discursive prophecy given to the church, as way marks, down to the resurrection, and Rome *not* named in it later than 30 years *before the birth* of Christ!

Passing by the struggles of Egypt and Syria for the ascendancy, and their resistance to the Romans, we come at once to the 20th verse, chap. xi., and read, “Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom; but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.”

We apply the test of truth, the exegesis of the passage, in which we find an allusion (verse 22) to the breaking of “the prince of the covenant.” But the verse we have selected (20) for this test speaks

of a "raiser of taxes." Turning to Luke ii. we have the key: "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed." This was about the time of Christ's birth, and Gibbon's history says, "We find that Augustus had no sooner assumed the reins of government, than he frequently intimated the insufficiency of the tributes, and by cautious and well weighed steps. The *introduction* of *customs* was followed by the establishment of an excise, and the scheme of taxation was completed by an artful assessment on the real and personal property of the Roman citizens."

Thus Augustus was pre-eminently a raiser of taxes. He not only maintained the old, but established new ones.

This fact fastened upon Cæsar Augustus, following in due course, in the prophecy which can be applied to none but Julius Cæsar, who stumbled and fell, not in battle, but in the Senate chamber, by the hand of Brutus and others. Hedged about as Augustus is by Luke ii., and by the times and fate of his predecessor, and followed by the *vile* Tiberius, who obtained the kingdom, but *its honor was gone*. "He came in peaceably and obtained the kingdom by flatteries." This is very strikingly proved. That Tiberius sustained the prediction, see Ency., Philada. Ed., 1798, also *Ancient and Modern History*; by Rev. R. Robbins. Hartford Ed.



## THE VILE PERSON.

“Tiberius, during the first eight or nine years of his reign, put on the appearance of justice and moderation, practising the most consummate dissimulations.”

“Obtain the kingdom by flatteries.” Gabriel.

“His vicious and tyrannical disposition was indulged during this time in a very covert manner ; but afterward it was openly manifested, and carried to a most terrible extreme.”

“Either prevailed upon by persuasions, or pursuing the natural turn of his temper, which led to indulgence and debauchery, in the twelfth year of his reign, he left Rome and went into Campania, under pretence of dedicating temples to Jupiter and Augustus. After this, though he removed to several places, he never returned to Rome ; but spent the greatest part of his time in the island of Caprea, a place rendered as infamous by his pleasures as detestable by his cruelties, which were shocking to human nature. Buried in this retreat, he gave himself up to his pleasures, quite regardless of the miseries of his subjects.”

“In person most displeasing, his face was all broke out into ulcers, and covered over with plasters ; his body was bent forward, while its unnatural tallness and leanness increased its ugliness ; with such a person and a mind still more hideous, being gloomy, suspicious, and cruel, he spent whole nights

in debaucheries at the table, and raised men to the first posts of the empire for no other merit than having assisted him two whole days and nights in his gluttony, and made one Novellus Torgnatus a Prætor, for being able to drink off five bottles of wine at a draught. His luxuries of another kind were still more detestable, and seemed to increase with his drunkenness and gluttony. He obliged the most eminent women of Rome to sacrifice to him their virtue and honor ; and all his inventions only seemed calculated how to make his vices more extravagant and abominable. The numberless obscene medals dug up in that island to this day bear witness at once to his shame and the veracity of the historians who have described his debaucheries. He caused his two sons to be starved to death in prison, while Agrippina, their mother, was sent into banishment.

In putting to death sixteen out of twenty senators whom he had chosen for his council, he uttered a sentiment never to be forgotten in the records of human cruelty : " Let them hate me, so long as they obey me." In this manner there was not a day without some barbarous executions, in which the sufferers were obliged to undergo the most shameful indignities and exquisite torments. When Camillius had killed himself to avoid the torture, " Ah ! (cried Tiberius) how that man has been able to escape me !" When a prisoner earnestly entreated that he would not defer his death, " No (cried the tyrant), I am not sufficiently your friend to shorten your torment."

“Tiberius delighted to witness the tortures of those who were put to death before him.”

“His jealousy, which fastened on persons of the highest distinction, induced him to condemn them to death on the slightest pretence. Indeed, to such an extent were legalized murders carried, that he began to grow weary of particular executions, and therefore gave orders that all the accused should be put to death together, without further examination. The whole city of Rome was filled with slaughter and mourning. The place of execution was a horrible scene; dead bodies putrefying lay heaped on each other, while even the friends of the wretched convicts were denied the satisfaction of weeping.”

Such was the *vile* Tiberius, the immediate successor of Cæsar Augustus (a raiser of taxes), and the third person named by character in this scripture referring to Roman history. Who came into power by flattery and deception, to whom they did not give the *honor* of the kingdom, for Rome *had no honor* when he came into power, as the following will show:

“Luxury and the arts having enervated the Roman people, and the former civil wars and the consequent calamities having paved the way for a different order of things, in *the quiet establishment of despotism under Augustus, their fate from this time was fixed*. He found no difficulty in riveting their chains, and for long ages a series of despots, most of them monsters of vice and cruelty, ruled with a

rod of iron this once liberty-loving people, and mistress of nations."

As "a vile person," history does not present a viler than Tiberius Cæsar. For other points of his character, see our author's Prophetic Exposition, vol. ii., pp. 34-38, taken from Bishop Newton's Exposition of Daniel, eleventh chapter. His interpretation of this part of the prophecy cannot be refuted,—history and this prophecy are too well marked to be successfully disputed.

Talk about "a vile person" in the future to surpass the vileness of Tiberius Cæsar! the civilized world could not contain him as a ruler. The credulity of mankind is great, but not great enough in this age to believe in what is assigned, by our author, to be done by a "future vile person," "who is also the little horn." P. 27.

Now as our author did endorse Bishop Newton's exposition, which, he tells us, "I can see no way in which it can be materially improved, giving this prophecy entire, or at most with some slight alteration in the phraseology, to verse 14th," Proph. Ex., vol. i. p. 3, we are ready to ask, when did he find Newton's Exposition from the 14th verse altogether erroneous?—we ask when? Let him refute, now, what he has endorsed, or stand convicted of propagating confusion in the church. We do not ask a man to believe a thing simply because he once believed it; but what we do ask, and *demand*, of any teacher, is that he shall first refute his own errors, if he has

been in error ; then we shall be ready to hear him. It is truth that maketh manifest, not speculation.

Having sufficiently, and we think conclusively shown Bishop Newton to have been correct in fixing upon Tiberius as the vile person mentioned by the angel to Daniel in verse 21, and per consequence our author's present theory proved to be a myth,—a shadow without substance,—we will remove from his fabrication another fallacious prop, which will help to show how utterly untenable such a theory is, which is called “a plain, literal, and grammatical construction of the last five chapters of Daniel,” &c.

#### THE KING OF THE SOUTH, AND THE KING OF THE NORTH.

There need be no doubt but that Newton's remarks on the king of the South and king of the North are correct, on verses 5—15, not from his reasoning, perhaps, but from the historical facts concerning Egypt and Syria which he has abundantly sought out and supplied. But as these terms, king of the South and North, are not proper names, it follows that they can only be geographical designations, and as the events embraced in this prophecy change, and are enacted by different powers and on other territory than that of Egypt and Syria, and the former attempts to apply the 40th verse to the doings of Napoleon Bonaparte in those lands were manifestly not correct, therefore, to say that the

40th verse was fulfilled in the war which he waged against Egypt and Syria, is to claim what did not, and could not fulfil the words of the prophecy.

Facts in connection with the first French revolution will show to whom these later geographical terms in the 40th verse belong:

The infidel power of France did not spring up in a year; it was the work of a long period, reaching back to the days of the reformation; hence the angel, speaking of placing the abomination that maketh desolate, immediately introduces, verse 32, "the people that do know their God;" telling of their work and suffering,—“yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil.” But they receive a little help: “And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end; because it is yet for a time appointed.” The 1260 days had not yet expired, therefore this time of suffering to the church was “yet for a time appointed.” So far is the description of the people of God, under the Papacy, down to the times when its successor began to be developed, whom the angel introduces by declaring: “And the king shall do according to his will.” V. 36.

The character of this power is described down to the end of the 39th verse, and from the last clause of the 40th verse,—“He shall enter into the countries,” etc., to the end of the chapter, its work is foretold and its end predicted.

France under infidel rule fulfilling every particular of the angel's prediction, in this line of prophecy, as can be proven, we ask then, what power was south of France, and "pushed at him?" The answer must be, Spain. Again, what power was north of France? and all the world knows it to be England.

"The *first* coalition against France took place in 1793, and was composed of England, Spain, and the Stadtholders. Let it be remembered that there were six of these coalitions with which she contended, and that all the nations of Europe were, at one time or another, engaged." Then we have this striking fact brought out, that in the first coalition, 1793, Spain made a push (only) at France, of which she soon had reason to repent, being over-run by the French. Not so with England, "the king of the North;" she did in that very year "come against him (France) like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships." Notice that at this time Louis XVI. was killed, and the infidel power was fully inaugurated, and that just 1260 years prior to this event, the saints were given into the hand of the little horn, by the Justinian decree of A. D. 533. These are not mere assertions, but facts that can be proved beyond question or reasonable doubt.

Apply the prophecy of the 40th verse to Egypt and Syria, and say that it was fulfilled at this time, viz., 1793, and all history declares the application

false; say that Napoleon's career in those regions fulfilled it, and we ask how? Was it a "push" that the Mamelukes made against him in Egypt? and as to Syria, had she "many ships," with which to come against him like a whirlwind? These questions must be answered in the negative.

Syria had no ships of her own, and those used by Sir Sydney Smith were only used for the relief of St. Jean d'Acre, in 1799.

England's power was great in her ships; her wooden walls were the boast of her sailors, and the pride of the nation.

"Every sentiment of abhorrence towards the French republic was now kindled into a flame, when the intelligence was received of the condemnation and public execution of Louis XVI.; and on the 28th of January, 1793, a message from the king was sent down to Parliament, acquainting both houses that he had directed copies of several papers received from M. Chauvelin, and the answers to them, to be laid before them; \* \* \* also that he thought it necessary to make a further augmentation of his forces, both by sea and land. On the 25th of February, 1793, the troops left London for Greenwich, accompanied by the king and queen, and others of the royal family, where they embarked, and proceeded to the coast of Holland, from whence they marched to join the combined army."

Between these dates, January 28th and February 25th, the king sent a message to Parliament, couched



in very significant language, which I have from one that was there at the time. In answer to the usual question put to the minister, when appearing in the house of Parliament in his official character,—“what have you there, Mr. Pitt?” “A message from the king.” The import of it was as follows :

“The king (of England) has no cause of quarrel against the king of France, nor against the government of France, but against the infidel rulers thereof he has found it necessary to declare war, and he trusts his beloved commoners will sustain him in the measure.” This was when the infidels of France had taken full possession of the government, and Louis’ life no longer trembled in the balance, in that ever memorable year 1793. Then England sent “her many ships,” with her “chariots and horsemen,” and hurled them against France “like a whirlwind.” The king (or kingdom) that did according to its will was now confessed to be the ruling power, which succeeded the legitimate government of France; and “the king of the South pushed at him, and the king of the North came against him like a whirlwind, with chariots and horsemen, and many ships.” Napoleon came not into notice until Barras said to his colleagues (Carnot and Tallien), “I have the man whom you want: a little Corsican officer, who will not stand upon ceremony.” This was in 1795, when Bonaparte cut down the inhabitants of Paris with grape-shot and canister, and afterward rapidly rose to power. But

he was not the hero of the prophecy of Daniel's 11th chapter; he was only an instrument of that power, that did according to its will; he partook of its spirit, and carried forward the work; and his doings both in Europe and Asia mark the epoch of that "perfectly atheistic and blasphemous" power which took the place, or succeeded the abomination that maketh desolate.

#### THE MAN OF SIN, NOT THE WILFUL KING.

How remarkable is the prophecy worded when speaking of its infidel character; in some respects it resembles the language of Paul in 2d Thess., but yet there is enough difference to show that they are not the same, the one "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." "And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every God, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished; for that that is determined shall be done. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any God: for he shall magnify himself above all." Dan. xi. 36, 37.

Infidel France, although as a marvellous power succeeding, as it did, a legitimate government, and following in time the times of the papacy, *it never*

*sat in the temple of God, showing that it was God.* They pretended to worship a woman, in mockery of all religious worship; this their fathers knew not, for they worshipped the papacy, Paul's man of sin, from the days of Clovis, king of the Franks.

The papal hierarchy acknowledged the God of heaven, but set itself up as God, in the temple of God; but that infidel power acknowledged no God but their own reason. "Gobet, the bishop of Paris, was brought forward, in full procession, to declare to the convention that the religion which he had taught so many years was, in every respect, a piece of priestcraft, which had no foundation either in history or sacred truth. He disowned, in solemn and explicit terms, the existence of the Deity, to whose worship he had been consecrated."

"One of the ceremonies of this insane time stands unrivalled for absurdity, combined with impiety. The doors of the convention were thrown open to a band of musicians; preceded by whom the members of the municipal body entered in solemn procession, singing a hymn in praise of liberty, and escorting as the object of their future worship—a veiled female, whom they termed the Goddess of Reason. Being brought within the bar, she was unveiled with great form, and placed on the right hand of the President, when she was generally recognized as a dancing girl of the opera, with whose charms most of the persons present were acquainted from her appearance on the stage, while the experience of individu-

als was farther extended. To this person, as the fittest representative of that reason whom they worshipped, *the national convention of France rendered public homage.*"

This impious and ridiculous mummary was renewed and imitated throughout the nation.

They regarded not the God of their fathers, nor the desire of women; they abolished marriage, etc., of which we cannot now write, but of which there is abundant proof to fix this part of the prophecy upon France, culminating in the year 1793.

Napoleon Bonaparte had little or nothing to do with the time and events which we have briefly alluded to, for not until 1796 was he placed at the head of the French army in Italy, and here began his career as the *instrument* of the infidel power of France, and all that follows in the language of the angel, "He shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over; he shall enter also into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown." But why need I write these plain facts, which no one acquainted with history will attempt to deny? His career in Egypt and Syria led him to the borders of Edom, Moab, and Ammon, but these escapead out of his hand; it was in his heart to have united them all under his sway. Hear him when baffled by the Mamelukes, "Could I have united the Mameluke horse to the French infantry, I should have reckoned myself master of the world." "The land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall

